



Puttick, M., & Thomas, G. (2015). Fossils and living taxa agree on patterns of body mass evolution: A case study with Afrotheria. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 282(1821). <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2015.2023>

Peer reviewed version

License (if available):  
CC BY

Link to published version (if available):  
[10.1098/rspb.2015.2023](https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2015.2023)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)  
PDF-document

Copyright © 2015 The Royal Society. All rights reserved. Terms, conditions and policies.

## University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

### General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:  
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

## PROCEEDINGS B

### **Fossils and living taxa agree on patterns of body mass evolution: a case study with Afrotheria**

Journal:	<i>Proceedings B</i>
Manuscript ID	RSPB-2015-2023.R2
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	11-Nov-2015
Complete List of Authors:	Puttick, Mark; University of Bristol, Earth Sciences Thomas, Gavin; University of Sheffield, Department of Animal and Plant Sciences
Subject:	Evolution < BIOLOGY, Palaeontology < BIOLOGY
Keywords:	evolution, fossil, Afrotheria, macroevolution, body mass, ancestral size estimation
Proceedings B category:	Palaeontology

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1 **Mark N. Puttick<sup>1</sup>, Gavin H. Thomas<sup>2</sup>**

2 *School of Earth Sciences, Wills Memorial Building, Queen's Road, University of Bristol, Bristol, BS8*  
3 *1RJ, UK*

4 <sup>2</sup> *Department of Animal and Plant Sciences, Alfred Denny Building, University of Sheffield, Western*  
5 *Bank, Sheffield, S10 2TN, UK*

6 Author for correspondence: Mark N. Puttick

7 E-mail: mark.puttick@bristol.ac.uk

8 Title: Fossils and living taxa agree on patterns of body mass evolution: a case study with Afrotheria

9 Word Count: 5925

**Abstract**

Most of life is extinct, so incorporating some fossil evidence into analyses of macroevolution is typically seen as necessary to understand the diversification of life and patterns of morphological evolution. Here we test the effects of inclusion of fossils in a study of the body size evolution of afrotherian mammals, a clade that includes the elephants, sea cows, and elephant shrews. We find that the inclusion of fossil tips has little impact on analyses of body mass evolution; from a small ancestral size (~ 100 grams), there is a shift in rate and an increase in mass leading to the larger-bodied Paenungulata and Tubulidentata regardless of whether fossils are included or excluded from analyses. For Afrotheria, the inclusion of fossils and morphological character data affects phylogenetic topology, but these differences have little impact upon patterns of body mass evolution and these body mass evolutionary patterns are consistent with the fossil record. The largest differences between our analyses result from the evolutionary model, not the addition of fossils. For some clades, extant-only analyses may be reliable to reconstruct body mass evolution, the addition of fossils and careful model selection is likely to increase confidence and accuracy of reconstructed macroevolutionary patterns.

**Keywords:** evolution, fossil, body mass, ancestral size reconstruction, Afrotheria, macroevolution

## 28 Introduction

29 Body mass evolution of Mammalia has received considerable attention in the literature [1-  
30 11]. Particular interest has been shown in changes in body size following the K-Pg mass  
31 extinction [1], the modes of evolution [2,5], and how rates vary through geological time [3,7].  
32 Many studies have approached these issues from an extant-species only perspective (e.g.  
33 [3,4]), but there is an increasing awareness of the importance of including fossils in  
34 macroevolutionary analyses [5,6,8-10,12].

35 Studying events in deep time using only extant taxa is problematic, as ignoring fossil data can  
36 introduce biases and inaccurate reconstruction of phylogenies and macroevolutionary patterns  
37 [13]. Further, when studying morphological change, the inclusion of fossils can improve  
38 ancestral state estimates in deep time: models with fossil information may fit better than  
39 models without [5,6,8-10] and fossil evidence can be used as prior information on ancestral  
40 body mass [8]. However, there is some suggestion that studies of macroevolution may be  
41 obscured by fossil evidence as it can obfuscate patterns by introducing its own biases [11].  
42 One area that is particularly sensitive to the inclusion of fossils is ancestral state  
43 reconstruction. Ancestral state reconstruction is generally difficult [14,15] and ignoring fossil  
44 evidence can lead to over-inflated estimates of ancestral mass [6].

45 Methodological approaches, as well as the inclusion of fossils, can greatly influence  
46 interpretations of macroevolution. Many methods employ a gradualistic Brownian motion  
47 (BM) model to study body mass evolution [16-19] and many approaches have built on this  
48 framework to study evolutionary tempo [3,20,21] and mode [17-19,22,23]. Recently,  
49 parametric approaches have been employed that can model gradual evolution with sporadic  
50 bursts [24,25], so these are not rooted in the gradual evolution expectation of the BM model.  
51 Currently, the relative influence of model selection versus the inclusion or exclusion of  
52 fossils on our understanding of evolution is unclear. Indeed, it may be that models and fossils  
53 matter crucially in some circumstances, but not in others.

54 A first step to understanding the relative impacts of fossils and models on ancestral state  
55 reconstruction is to reconcile extant (typically molecular) and fossil (morphological)  
56 phylogenies. Recently developed methods allow for the incorporation of living and fossil data  
57 in phylogenies, by enabling the concurrent analysis of molecular and morphological  
58 characters [26,27]. An important step in this process is the use of fossils as tips to date  
59 phylogenies [26,27] compared to traditional node dating. Total-evidence dating resolves  
60 previous problems of uncertain assignment of fossils to nodes by including fossils in the  
61 phylogenetic analysis [28] and it has also been suggested that molecular data improves the  
62 resolution of phylogenies containing fossils [29].

63 Here we test the influence of the inclusion and exclusion of fossils on the rates and modes of  
64 afrotherian body mass evolution. Using a total-evidence analysis [27], fossils were  
65 incorporated from a morphological matrix [30], and evolutionary models were compared to  
66 both a traditional molecular-only node-dated tree, and a total-evidence tree that had the  
67 fossils removed.

Afrotheria, which includes elephants, hyraxes, and tenrecs, consists of around 77 extant species [31-33]. The general consensus on their relationships is that Afrotheria comprises two clades: Afroinsectiphilia, including Tubulidentata (aardvark), Afrosoricida (Chrysochloridae plus Tenrecidae) and Macroscelidea (elephant shrews), and the generally larger-bodied Paenungulata, including elephants and hyraxes [30,33]. Fossil afrotheres are known throughout the Cenozoic [34], and living forms are known to have a wide variation of body size that spans six orders of magnitude.

Surprisingly, we find the inclusion or exclusion of fossil tips has little impact on analyses of body mass macroevolution: with all phylogenies there is a relatively small ancestral body size for Afrotheria, and a branch-based shift in rate leading to Paenungulata and Tubulidentata. No datasets support Brownian motion models of evolution, and parametric rate-variable approaches indicate a smaller ancestral mass compared to Brownian motion estimates. The addition of fossil tips on the phylogeny here has little impact on evolutionary rate analyses, but there are differences attributable to model selection. Whilst inclusion of morphological characters and fossil species alters phylogenetic topology, these differences result in negligible differences in patterns of body mass evolution or ancestral body mass estimation. In some cases of macroevolutionary analyses, as here, it may be possible to reconstruct evolutionary history whilst using extant species only, although the addition of fossils will increase confidence of reconstructed patterns.

## Methods

### Taxa

We recognise a total of 77 extant afrotherian species (see electronic supplementary material, S1) [31], and we used a morphological matrix of fossil and extant afrotheres [30, 35]. The matrix contains a sample of fossil taxa across Afrotheria, and these fossils are generally early-diverging members of crown clades, so it is likely that they give good estimates of ancestral morphology and timing of diversification [27, 35]. We sample a total of 39 afrotherian fossils based on morphological data only and a further seven taxa for which molecular data is available (see below). For Afrotheria, the morphological data samples all extant orders, as well as fossil members of extant orders. Within Afrotheria, these fossil taxa are believed to be stem or crown members of extant families, with the possible exception of *Chambius kasserinensis* and *Herodotius pattersoni* [35]. Extant outgroup taxa were selected from Xenathra (3 species), Boreoeutheria (13 species), and marsupials (3 species). Additionally, we sampled two fossil crown placentals (*Montanalestes keeblerorum* and *Prokennalestes trofimovi*) (see electronic supplementary material, S1).

### Genetic Data

Genetic data were taken for six nuclear and four mitochondrial loci from Genbank [33, 36]. Genetic data were aligned using ClustalW [37], with protein-coding genes aligned by codons and non-protein genes by nucleotide. Unalignable regions were removed from non-coding sequences using GBlocks (version 0.91b) [38].

The following genes were used in the analyses: Growth Hormone Receptor (GHR), Alpha-2B Adrenergic Receptor (ADRA2B), Androgen Receptor (AR), von Willebrand Factor (vWF), Interphotoreceptor Retinoid-Binding Protein (IRBP), and Brain-Derived Neurotrophic Factor (BDNF) were the nuclear protein-coding genes, and Cytochrome b (*cytb*) and Nicotinamide Adenine Dinucleotide (NADH2) were the two mitochondrial protein-coding genes. Additionally, sequence data from the mitochondrial 12s and 16s genes were collected. The dataset differs from Kuntner *et al.* [33] by the addition to Brain-Derived Neurotrophic Factor and some additional data for some species (see Supplementary Material S1). Of the 77 extant species recognised we have genetic data for 60 (approximately 78% of the total). When extinct species that have genetic information are included, coverage for Afrotheria species ranges from 67% for GHR to 25% for AR.

Data were also collected for extinct species in the analysis. As with Kuntner *et al.* [33], we gathered information on the proboscideans *Elephas antiquus falconeri*, *Elephas cypriotes*, *Elephas maximus asurus*, and *Elephas* sp., and an undetermined species from Tilos island [32]. We also included the mastodon *Mammuth americanum*, and the mammoths *Mammuthus primigenius* and *Mammuthus columbii* and Steller's sea cow (*Hydrodamalis gigas*).

All alignments were checked by eye. PartitionFinder (version 1.1.1) [39] was used to select the partitions of genes and models of evolution for the genetic data. For most genes the best-fitting substitution model was the General Time-Reversible (GTR) model with gamma distributed rate variation between sites and a proportion of invariant sites. Exceptions to this model were the GTR with gamma distributed rate variation and no invariant sites (*cytB*), the Kimura 82 model (GHR), and the Kimura 82 model with a proportion of invariant sites (BDNF).

Phylogenies

Phylogenies were constructed and dated in MrBayes 3.2.5 [40]. All phylogenetic analyses were run for twenty million generations sampling every 1000 generations, with four chains and four independent runs for each analysis. The heating parameter was set to 0.05 for analyses that included fossils and 0.1 for analyses that did not include fossils. Priors were set using established protocols [27] (see electronic supplementary material, S1), and convergence was judged using in-built diagnostics of MrBayes and Tracer [41].

An initial non-clock analysis was run on the entire dataset of fossils and extant species, with no calibration on ages (see Supplementary Materials S5, and Supplementary Fig. S2).

Time-calibrated analyses

We conducted three sets of dating analyses (i) node and tip dating using both morphological and molecular data (total-evidence analysis), (ii) node only dating using molecular data only (node-dating analyses), and (iii) node only dating using both morphological and molecular data. For both the total-evidence and node-dating analyses, the following nodes were calibrated at Theria (root), Marsupialia, Placentalia (crown), Boreoeutheria, Atlantogenata, Xenarthra, Afrotheria, Paenungulata, and Macroscelidea. Node dates were set as offset-

exponential distributions with dates primarily taken from a published source [42]. For the total-evidence analysis, tip dates came from 41 unconstrained species believed to be Afrotheria and from two stem placentals. Tip dates for fossils were set as uniform distributions, with dates taken from the FossilWorks [43] portal which accesses data in the Paleobiology Database [44] (see electronic supplementary material, S6). However these data were further checked using the primary literature (see Supplementary Table S2). For the total-evidence analyses there were 50 dating points on the phylogeny (41 tips dates and nine node dates). In MrBayes, we set the fossilised birth-death model [45] as tree prior. The fossilised birth-death model relaxes the assumption of a uniform prior between the timing of nodes and incorporates estimates of speciation, extinction, and fossil sampling rates into the tree prior. In this model we assumed that fossil tips are sampled as branching lineages ('Samplestrat=fossiltip') but not as direct ancestors sitting on branches as is used in some models (i.e., not in the implementation in [46]). Priors for the speciation, extinction, and sampling rates were set at their defaults as according to MrBayes 3.2.5: the speciation rate prior ('SpeciationPr') was set to an exponential distribution with rate 1, and the relative extinction rate prior ('Extinctionpr') and the relative fossilisation rate ('FossilizationPr') were both set to a Beta distribution (mean = 1, shape = 1) which gives a uniform prior between 0-1.

For the total evidence analysis the following topological constraints were applied: Marsupalia, Boreoeutheria, Atlantogenata, Xenarthra, crown Placentalia, Afrotheria, Paenungulata, Proboscidea, Sirenia, Hyracoidea, Macroscelidea, crown Macroscelidea, and Chrysochloridae. These clade memberships were based upon an initial unconstrained non-clock phylogenetic analysis.

#### Body Mass Data

Measurements of body mass were obtained for extant and extinct species in the phylogeny. Body mass data for extant species were predominantly taken from published estimates (see electronic supplementary material, S12). For the extinct species, the preferred data sources were from previously published mass estimates; when published data were not available, body masses were mainly estimated from regression equations on molar area [47] (see electronic supplementary material, S12).

#### Models of Body Mass Evolution

Models of body mass evolution were tested on a selection of trees to assess the impact of fossils. For a direct comparison of the effects of fossils, body mass evolution was tested on the total-evidence phylogeny (i), and on the total-evidence phylogeny with fossils removed (ii). Furthermore, models were tested on the molecular-only node-dated phylogeny (iii), as this reflects the classic approach to construct time-calibrated phylogenies for comparative analyses. Additionally, models were tested on the node-dated phylogeny constructed using molecular and morphological data (iv).

The BM model is commonly used either to model trait evolution on phylogenies directly or as a basis for more complex models. The BM model assumes, on a phylogeny with branch



lengths scaled to time, that variation in trait data accumulates proportionally through time, with a mean expectation of zero change in the value of the trait per unit time. However, the model makes assumptions that may be unrealistic [24,25]. The nature of the model means that variance, and therefore rates, are finite and do not change in the phylogeny [25]. Therefore, to incorporate any rate variation the model must be extended with extra parameters to model changes in rate [3,20,21,48]. If this is performed over the entire phylogeny with each branch permitted to take a unique rate [48], the result is that the model has too many parameters for justifiable inference – a new rate on every branch in a fully bifurcating phylogeny results in nearly as twice as many parameters ( $2n-2$  where  $n$  is tips) as data points (values at the tips). An alternative to modelling specific changes in rates is to use parametric models that do not assume constant rates, by sampling rates from a heavy-tailed, rather than normal, distribution [24, 25]. This achieves two objectives: these models do not require a homogeneous gradual model of evolution, and they allow for an ancestral trait reconstruction with a model of rate evolution that is not over-parameterised.

We use the software StableTraits to parametrically model gradual evolution with intermittent bursts and to reconstruct ancestral size estimates and model rates through time [25]. StableTraits samples from a symmetrical, mean zero distribution which is defined by its index of stability ( $\alpha$ ): for BM  $\alpha=2$ , which results in a normal distribution, but when  $\alpha<2$  this results in a shallower distribution with heavy tails which allows for a more unpredictable evolutionary trajectory. For all trees, results from a heavy tailed distribution in which the  $\alpha$  is allowed to vary from BM were compared to a BM model in terms of the rates through time, ancestral size estimation, and the model fit [25]. The MCMC chain was run for 2000000 iterations with four runs, until the Potential Scale Reduction Factor went below 1.01. The burn-in was set to 10%, with the output containing the calculated rates, ancestral states, and maximum posterior probability. The model was tested against a model fixed to BM by re-running the analyses with  $\alpha = 2$ , and then comparing the Bayesian Predictive Information Criterion (BPIC) [25]. Subsequent data processing and plotting were carried out in R [49].

#### Prior information on ancestral mass

To introduce further information for the ancestral mass estimation for Afrotheria, an arbitrary outgroup tip was added and set a given mass to represent knowledge from the fossil record or ancestral estimates from previous studies; this outgroup was separated from Afrotheria by either 5 Myr (the edge leading to the tip of the outgroup was 0.01 Myr). 5 Myr was the original length separating the Afrotheria from the Xenarthra and would allow prior information to influence the root, but the mass value could change over the length. In different analyses the outgroup was given a mass of 0.1, 0.5, 1, 5, 10, and 20 kg respectively. The values incorporate estimates for late Cretaceous mammals from the fossil record, ~80g [1], as well as larger estimates for ancestral Afrotheria from genomic studies, ~0.5–30 kg [e.g. 4].

## Results

### Topology and divergence times

The total-evidence phylogeny (figure 1) and non-clock phylogeny (see electronic supplementary material, figure S2) are very similar, and the composition of all the major clades is identical.

Larger differences are seen when morphological data is included compared to molecular-only topologies: in all analyses with the morphological cladistic matrix Afroinsectiphilia is not monophyletic as Macroscelidea is closer to Paenungulata. The composition of crown families is consistent, but the position of fossil taxa do vary between analyses. For example, the fossils *Chambius* and *Herodotius* move from sister of Paenungulata plus Tubulidentata in the non-clock topology to being in a basal polytomy with Macroscelidea in the total-evidence analysis.

Ages from the total-evidence analysis that includes fossils (figure 1) are older than the ages from node-dating analysis (Table 1).

#### Ancestral States

For all analyses, neither rates nor ancestral body size reconstructions are strongly influenced by the inclusion of in-group fossils. Additionally, for all analyses the StableTraits model provided a better fit for the data than BM.

In the total-evidence based approach with no-outgroups and rate heterogeneous (StableTraits) model the ancestral size at the origin of the Afrotheria is estimated to be 0.10 kg (95% CIs 0.02-0.95 kg). In contrast, the BM estimate is an order of magnitude larger 1.45 kg (95% CIs, 0.31-6.82 kg); however, the broad confidence intervals overlap with those of the rate heterogeneous model (table 2; figure 2). The fit of the heavy tailed rate heterogeneous model ( $\alpha = 1.77$ , 1.47-1.94) was superior to the BM model ( $\alpha = 2$ ) ( $\Delta\text{BPIC} = 21.8$ ).

Removal of fossils caused little difference in the ancestral size estimation of Afrotheria (0.13kg) but had a marked effect on the confidence intervals, which became much wider (0.02-12.48 kg). For the molecular-only node dating analysis, the ancestral size for estimate Afrotheria was 0.11 kg (95% CIs, 0.02-761.4 kg). Similar results were found for the combined morphological-molecular node-dating analysis (Table 2).

#### Evolutionary Rates from StableTraits

In all StableTraits analyses there is an increase in the rate of body mass evolution leading to the Tubulidentata plus Paenungulata (figure 2). For the total-evidence analysis, the increase leading to Tubulidentata plus Paenungulata is 137.7 times the original branch length (length of the identical branch on the time-scaled input phylogeny) (figure 2), compared to an increase of 117.0 times the original length when fossils are removed from the phylogeny. The rate increases are less dramatic for the molecular-only node-dated phylogeny (35.2 times the original rate) and the morphology and molecular node-dated phylogeny (19.9 times the original rate). On the morphology and molecular node-dated tree with only extant taxa there is also a further increase (37.3 times the original rate) leading to the Proboscidea plus Sirenia.

## Impact of prior information

The addition of outgroups of variable mass (0.1 to 20 kg) had little impact on estimates of ancestral mass for Afrotheria (Supplementary Table S2 and S3) or rates through time (Supplementary Figure S7). Even when the outgroup represents a body mass that is much larger than those known from the fossil record (e.g., 20 kg), the mass estimates from ancestral Afrotheria are relatively small ( $\sim 2$  kg), indicating the stability of the reconstructed patterns in this study.

## Discussion

Congruent patterns of body mass evolution are produced when fossil tips are included or excluded. The addition of fossil tips to analyses has little effect on the analyses of ancestral mass estimation and rates of body mass evolution through time. A number of studies have argued that fossils are vital to understand patterns of body mass evolution [6,8-10], but results from analyses in Afrotheria are consistent if fossil tips are included or excluded from phylogenies. The minor impact of fossil tips on macroevolutionary interpretations in this case may be expected: the afrotherian fossil record is biased towards Paenungulata [34], and none of the fossils in the clades is larger or smaller than extant members of those clades. Furthermore, there is generally a bias in the fossil record of the two groups: with the exception of Macroscelidea, the fossil record of Afroinsectiphilia is not as comprehensive as the record of Paenungulata [34], but there is fossil representation of all the major clades included in our analyses. There is no evidence to suggest that earlier afroinsectiphilians (excluding tubulidentates) were much larger than today's species, whereas some extinct hyraxes were indeed much larger than their extant relatives. Fossils, or at least morphological character data, do have large impacts on the topology of Afrotherian phylogeny. However, these differences in topology do not have a large impact on analyses of body mass evolution in this study, but instead show how different data types and fossil inclusion can change our interpretations of evolution. More evident than the inclusion or exclusion of fossils is the impacts of model selection.

Despite the minor impact of fossils in estimating ancestral body size in the Afrotheria, we do not suggest that these results should be taken as grounds to ignore fossil data. Previous studies have demonstrated the need for phylogenetically informed sampling for ancestral state reconstruction [50]. Recent studies have suggested the results here – that fossils have little impact upon reconstructions of morphological evolution - may not be applicable to other clades, such as birds [51], or even all mammals [6,8-10]. As noted above, the distribution of fossil tips and sizes may explain their minor impact in this specific case. The omission or misplacement of taxa, whether fossil or extant, can effect estimates of evolutionary rates and ancestral states. Moreover, our results suggest that inclusion of fossil data may increase confidence in ancestral state estimates. Fossils may still be very important in studies of body mass evolution, but exploration of alternative evolutionary models can also be important. A recent study has shown that careful model selection can elucidate body mass evolution patterns from extant data that have previously only been shown in fossils [52]; here we support that the evolutionary model can have a large impact on our interpretations of

evolution. It will often be difficult to judge *a priori* whether fossils or the evolutionary model will matter more and as such both should be assessed wherever possible.

The largest difference in reconstructions of body mass evolution in Afrotheria is not when fossils are included or excluded, but when comparing alternative evolutionary models. Mesozoic mammals, including early Placentalia, have been shown to be generally small (~80 g) [1] and high morphological rates of change are found early in the evolution of clades (Raia et al. 2013). In contrast, genomic studies have indicated a larger ancestral mass for Afrotheria [4,53]. Our results are congruent with the fossil record, whether fossils or included or excluded (figure 2). Furthermore, other studies have found similarly small ancestral sizes for the Afrotheria (0.36 kg) using the same method (StableTraits) but different data [25]. There is a ~10 fold difference in estimates from StableTraits and BM (Table 2); this suggests that model selection, rather than inclusion of fossils has a greater impact in reconstructed ancestral body mass. However, it should be noted that in all cases the confidence intervals for StableTraits and BM ancestral size estimates overlap (Table 2). Whilst there are general difficulties in reconstructing ancestral mass [14-15], fossil tips do not necessarily impact on either the best fitting evolutionary model or the ancestral state estimates. Our results appear to be robust to the possibility of undiscovered afrotherian species with extreme body sizes as demonstrated by the very minor effect of manipulating a proxy prior on the root. The main effect of an informed prior, such as previous estimates (e.g., [4]), is to tighten the confidence intervals for ancestral state estimates.

Previously total-evidence data have been shown to produce both younger and older ages than node dating [27, 54], but other studies (e.g. [55]) are congruent with the results here in that the majority of node ages are older in the total-evidence analyses (see electronic supplementary material, figure S5). Here the evidence strongly suggests that fossils are pushing median dates back in time; a similar result has been found generally for all mammals [55]. While these ages are larger than large-scale molecular estimates [56], they are not implausible [55] and there is still an overlap in the posterior distributions of ages on the major nodes and root; thus there is no significant effect from the morphological matrix on divergence time estimation. Additional studies that have employed the fossilised birth-death model [46] have found that employing a method that allows for sampling fossils as direct ancestors generally results in age estimates that are more congruent with the fossil record [46, 57-59]. However, many of these studies (e.g. [57]) find that traditional node-constraints can result in ages that are congruent with the fossil record, which appears to be the case here.

## Conclusions

Fossils have a vital role to play in the understanding of macroevolution. However, it is important to note that the addition of fossils will not always produce results that contradict analyses based on extant taxa. Data from fossils, in some cases, will agree with data from living species, so other factors, such as the choice of evolutionary model, are likely to be also important when elucidating patterns of evolution. Therefore, it may be possible to trust analyses based on extant taxa only, but incorporating fossil information and careful model selection can increase confidence in our interpretations.

**Acknowledgements:** We are grateful to Michael Benton, Phil Donoghue, members of the Bristol Palaeobiology Group, and three reviewers for suggestions that improved the manuscript. We also thank Arne Mooers for suggestions on ancestral state reconstruction and Fred Ronquist for advice. Phylogenetic analyses were carried out using the computational facilities of the Advanced Computing Research Centre, University of Bristol - <http://www.bris.ac.uk/acrc/>.

**Data accessibility:** input files for phylogenetic analysis, and the body mass data are available in the electronic supplementary materials.

**Funding Statement:** We thank NERC for grants NE/K500823/1 to M.N.P. and a Royal Society University Research Fellowship to G.H.T.

#### **Authors' contributions**

MNP and GHT devised the project, MNP carried out the analyses, MNP wrote the first draft and MNP and GHT revised and edited subsequent drafts of the manuscript.

#### **References**

1. Alroy J. 1999 The fossil record of North American mammals: evidence for a Paleocene evolutionary radiation. *Syst. Biol.* 48, 107-118. (doi:10.1080/106351599260472)
2. Cooper N, Purvis A. 2010 Body size evolution in mammals: complexity in tempo and mode. *Am. Nat.* 175, 727-738. (doi:10.1086/652466.)
3. Venditti CA, Meade A, Pagel M. 2011 Multiple routes to mammalian diversity. *Nature* 479, 393-396. (doi:10.1038/nature10516)
4. Lartillot N, Delsuc F. 2012 Joint reconstruction of divergence times and life-history evolution in placental mammals using a phylogenetic covariance model. *Evolution* 66, 1773-1787. (doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.2011.01558.x)
5. Slater GJ. 2013 Phylogenetic evidence for a shift in the mode of mammalian body size evolution at the Cretaceous-Palaeogene boundary. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* 4, 734-744. (doi:10.1111/2041-210X.12084)

- 372 6. Finarelli JA, Flynn JJ. 2006 Ancestral state reconstruction of body size in the  
373 Caniformia (Carnivora Mammalia): the effects of incorporating data from the fossil  
374 record. *Syst. Biol.* 55, 301-313. (doi:10.1080/10635150500541698)
- 375 7. Raia P, Carotenuto F, Passaro F, Piras P, Fulgione D, Werdelin L, Saarinen J,  
376 Fortelius M. 2013 Rapid action in the Palaeogene, the relationship between phenotypic and  
377 taxonomic diversification in Coenozoic mammals. *Proc. R. Soc. B* 280, 20122244.  
378 (doi:10.1098/rspb.2012.2244)
- 379 8. Slater GJ, Harmon LJ, Alfaro, ME. 2012 Integrating fossils with molecular  
380 phylogenies improves inference of trait evolution. *Evolution* 66, 3931-3944.  
381 (doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.2012.01723.x)
- 382 9. Finarelli JA, Goswami A. 2013 Potential pitfalls of reconstructing deep time  
383 evolutionary history with only extant data a case study using the Canidae (Mammalia  
384 Carnivora) *Evolution* 66, 3678-3685. (doi:10.1111/evo.12222.)
- 385 10. Pant SR, Goswami A, and Finarelli, JA. 2014. Complex body size trends in the  
386 evolution of sloths (Xenarthra: Pilosa). *BMC Evol. Biol.* 14, 184. (doi:10.1186/s12862-014-  
387 0184-1)
- 388 11. Monroe MJ, Bokma F. 2010 Short communication: little evidence for Cope's rule  
389 from Bayesian phylogenetic analysis of extant mammals. *J. Evol. Biol.* 23, 2017-2021. (doi:  
390 10.1111/j.1420-9101.2010.02051.x)
- 391 12. Quental TB, Marshall CR. 2010 Diversity dynamics: molecular phylogenies need  
392 the fossil record. *Trends Ecol. Evo.* 25, 434-441. (doi:10.1016/j.tree.2010.05.002)

- 393           13. Tarver JE, Donoghue PCJ. 2011 The trouble with topology: phylogenies without  
394 fossils provide a revisionist perspective of evolutionary history in topological analyses of  
395 diversity. *Syst Biol.* 60, 700-712. (doi:10.1093/sysbio/syr018)
- 396           14. Oakley TH, Cunningham, CW. 2000 Independent contrasts succeed where  
397 ancestor reconstruction fails in a known bacteriophage phylogeny. *Evolution* 54, 397-405.
- 398           15. Webster AJ, Purvis A. 2002 Testing the accuracy of methods for reconstructing  
399 ancestral states of continuous characters. *Proc R Soc B: Biol Sci* 269, 143-149.  
400 (doi:10.1098/rspb.2001.1873)
- 401           16. Felsenstein J. 1985 Phylogenies and the comparative method. *Am. Nat.* 125, 1-15.
- 402           17. Pagel M. 1997 Inferring evolutionary processes from phylogenies. *Zool.*  
403 *Scripta.* 26, 331-348. (doi:10.1111/j.1463-6409.1997.tb00423.x)
- 404           18. Pagel M. 1999 Inferring the historical patterns of biological evolution. *Nature* 401,  
405 877-884. (doi:10.1038/44766)
- 406           19. Freckleton RP, Harvey PH, Pagel M. 2002 Phylogenetic analysis and  
407 comparative data: a test and review of evidence. *Am. Nat.* 160, 712-726.  
408 (doi:10.1086/343873.)
- 409           20. Thomas GH, and Freckleton RP. 2012 MOTMOT: models of trait macroevolution  
410 on trees. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* 3, 145-151. (doi:10.1111/j.2041-210X.2011.00132.x)
- 411           21. O'Meara BC, Ané C, Sanderson MJ, Wainwright PC. 2006 Testing for different  
412 rates of continuous trait evolution using likelihood. *Evolution.* 60, 922-933.  
413 (doi:10.1111/j.0014-3820.2006.tb01171.x)

- 414 22. Blomberg SP, Garland T, Ives AR. 2003 Testing for phylogenetic signal in  
415 comparative data: behavioral traits are more labile. *Evolution* 57, 717-745. (doi:  
416 10.1111/j.0014-3820.2003.tb00285.x)
- 417 23. Harmon LJ, et al. 2010 Early bursts of body size and shape evolution are rare in  
418 comparative data. *Evolution* 64, 2385-2396. (doi: 10.1111/j.1558-5646.2010.01025.x)
- 419 24. Landis MJ, Schraiber JG, Liang M. 2013 Phylogenetic analysis using Lévy  
420 processes: finding jumps in the evolution of continuous traits. *Syst. Biol.* 62, 193-204.  
421 (doi:10.1093/sysbio/sys086)
- 422 25. Elliot MG, Mooers AØ. 2014 Inferring ancestral states without assuming  
423 neutrality or gradualism using a stable model of continuous character evolution. *BMC Evol.*  
424 *Biol.* 14, 226. doi:10.1186/s12862-014-0226-8.
- 425 26. Pyron RA. 2011. Divergence time estimation using fossils as terminal taxa and the  
426 origins of Lissamphibia. *Syst. Biol.* 60, 466–481. (doi:10.1093/sysbio/syr047)
- 427 27. Ronquist F, Klopstein S, Vilhelmsen L, Schulmeister S, Murray DL, Rasnitsyn  
428 AP. 2012 A total-evidence approach to dating with fossils, applied to the early radiation of  
429 the Hymenoptera. *Syst. Biol.* 61, 973-999. (doi:10.1093/sysbio/sys058)
- 430 28. Parham JF, et al. 2012 Best practices for justifying fossil calibrations. *Syst.*  
431 *Biol.* 61, 346-359. (doi:10.1093/sysbio/syr107)
- 432 29. Wiens JJ, Kuczynski, CA, Townsend T, Reeder TW, Mulcahy DG, Sites JW.  
433 2010 Combining phylogenomics and fossils in higher-level squamate reptile phylogeny:  
434 molecular data change the placement of fossil taxa. *Syst. Biol.* 59, 674-688. (doi:  
435 10.1093/sysbio/syq048.)



- 436           30. Seiffert ER. 2007 A new estimate of afrotherian phylogeny based on simultaneous  
437 analysis of genomic, morphological, and fossil evidence. BMC Evol. Biol. 7, 224. (doi:  
438 10.1186/1471-2148-7-224)
- 439           31. Wilson DE, Reeder DA, eds. 2005 Mammal species of the world. Johns Hopkins  
440 Univ. Press, Baltimore, MD.
- 441           32. Stanhope MJ, Madsen O, Waddell VG, Cleven GC, de Jong WW 1998 Highly  
442 congruent molecular support for a diverse superordinal clade of endemic African  
443 mammals. Mol. Phylogenet. Evo. 9, 501-508.
- 444           33. Kuntner M, May-Collado LJ, Agnarsson I. 2011 Phylogeny and conservation  
445 priorities of afrotherian mammals (Afrotheria, Mammalia). Zool. Scripta. 40, 1-15.  
446 (doi:10.1111/j.1463-6409.2010.00452.x)
- 447           34. Tabuce R, Asher RJ, Lehmann T. 2008 Afrotherian mammals: a review of current  
448 data. Mammalia 72, 2-14. (doi:10.1515/MAMM.2008.004)
- 449           35. Seiffert ER, Nasir S, Al-Harthy A, Groenke JR, Kraatz BP, Stevens NJ, Al-Sayigh  
450 AR. 2012 Diversity in the later Paleogene proboscidean radiation: a small barytheriid from  
451 the Oligocene of Dhofar Governorate, Sultanate of Oman. Naturwissenschaften 99,133-141.  
452 (doi:10.1007/s00114-011-0878-9.)
- 453           36. Benson DA, Clark K, Karsch-Mizrachi I, Lipman DJ, Ostell J, Sayers EW. 2015  
454 GenBank. Nucleic Acids Res. 43, D30–D35. (doi:10.1093/nar/gku1216)
- 455           37. Larkin MA. et al. 2007. Clustal W and Clustal X version 2.0. Bioinformatics 23:  
456 2947-2948. (doi:10. 1093/bioinformatics/btm404)

- 457 38. Castresana, J. 2002. Selection of conserved blocks from multiple alignments for  
458 their use in phylogenetic analysis. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 17: 540-552.
- 459 39. Lanfear R, Calcott B., Ho SY, Guindon S. 2012. PartitionFinder: combined  
460 selection of partitioning schemes and substitution models for phylogenetic analyses. *Mol.*  
461 *Biol. Evol.* 29, 1695-1701.(doi:10.1093/molbev/mss020)
- 462 40. Ronquist F, Teslenko M, van der Mark P, Ayres, DL, Darling A, Höhna S, Larget  
463 B, Liu L, Suchard MA, Huelsenbeck JP. 2012 MrBayes 3.2: efficient Bayesian phylogenetic  
464 inference and model choice across a large model space. *Syst. Biol.* 61, 539-542. (doi: doi:  
465 10.1093/sysbio/sys029)
- 466 41. Rambaut A, Suchard MA, Xie D, Drummond AJ. 2014 Tracer v1.6, Available  
467 from <http://beast.bio.ed.ac.uk/Tracer>
- 468 42. Benton MJ, Donoghue PCJ, Asher RJ, Friedman M, Near TJ, Vinther, J. 2015  
469 Constraints on the timescale of animal evolutionary history. *Palaeontol. Electron.* 18.1.1FC,  
470 1-106; [palaeo-electronica.org/content/fc-1](http://palaeo-electronica.org/content/fc-1)
- 471 43. Alroy J, Uhen MD, Behrensmeyer AK, Turner A. 2013 Taxonomic occurrences of  
472 Afrotheria recorded in Fossilworks, the Evolution of Terrestrial Ecosystems database, and the  
473 Paleobiology Database. Fossilworks. <http://fossilworks.org>.
- 474 44. Taxonomic occurrences of Afrotheria recorded in Fossilworks, the Evolution of  
475 Terrestrial Ecosystems database, and the Paleobiology Database <https://paleobiodb.org>
- 476 45. Stadler T. 2010. Sampling-through-time in birth–death trees. *J. Theor. Biol.* **267**,  
477 396-404. (doi:10.1016/j.jtbi.2010.09.010)

- 478           46. Heath TA, Huelsenbeck JP, Stadler T. 2014. The fossilized birth–death process  
479   for coherent calibration of divergence-time estimates. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 111,  
480   E2957-E2966. (doi: 10.1073/pnas.1319091111)
- 481           47. Bloch JJ, Rose KD, Gingerich PD. 1998. New species of *Batodonoides*  
482   (*Lipotyphla*, *Geolabididae*) from the early Eocene of Wyoming: smallest known mammal? *J.*  
483   *Mammal.* 79, 804-827.
- 484           48. Mooers AØ, Vamosi SM, Schluter D. 1999 Using phylogenies to test  
485   macroevolutionary hypotheses of trait evolution in cranes (*Gruinae*). *Am. Nat.* 154, 49-259.
- 486           49. R Core Team 2014. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R  
487   Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <http://www.R-project.org/>.
- 488           50. Ané C. 2008. Analysis of comparative data with hierarchical autocorrelation. *Ann.*  
489   *App. Stat.* 2, 1078-1102. (doi: 10.1214/08-AOAS 173)
- 490           51. Mitchell, JS. 2015. Extant-only comparative methods fail to recover the disparity  
491   preserved in the bird fossil record. *Evolution.* 69, 2414-2424. (doi: 10.1111/evo.12738)
- 492           52. Baker J, Meade A, Pagel M, and Venditti C. 2015. Adaptive evolution toward  
493   larger size in mammals. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 112, 5093-5098.  
494   (doi:10.1073/pnas.1419823112)
- 495           53. Romiguier J, Ranwez V, Douzery EJP, Galtier N. 2013 Genomic evidence for  
496   large, long-lived ancestors to placental mammals. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 30, 5-13.  
497   (doi:10.1093/molbev/mss211.)

- 498           54. Wood HM, Matzke NJ, Gillespie RG, Griswold CE. 2013 Treating fossils as  
499 terminal taxa in divergence time estimation reveals ancient vicariance patterns in the  
500 palpimanoid spiders. *Syst. Biol.* 62, 264-284. (doi:10.1093/sysbio/sys092.)
- 501           55. Beck RM, Lee MS. 2014 Ancient dates or accelerated rates? Morphological  
502 clocks and the antiquity of placental mammals. *Proc. R. Soc. B: Biol. Sci.* 281(1793).  
503 (doi:10.1098/rspb.2014.1278.)
- 504           56. dos Reis M, Inoue J, Hasegawa M, Asher RJ, Donoghue PCJ, Yang Z. 2012  
505 Phylogenomic datasets provide both precision and accuracy in estimating the timescale of  
506 placental mammal phylogeny. *Proc. R. Soc. B: Biol. Sci.* 279, 3491–3500.  
507 (doi:10.1098/rspb.2012.0683.)
- 508           57. Grimm GW, Kapli P, Bomfleur B, McLoughlin S, Renner SS. 2014. Using more  
509 than the oldest fossils: Dating Osmundaceae with three Bayesian clock approaches. *Syst.*  
510 *Biol.* (doi:10.1093/sysbio/syu108)
- 511           58. Arcila D, Pyron RA, Tyler JC, Ortí G, Betancur-R R. 2015. An evaluation of  
512 fossil tip-dating versus node-age calibrations in tetraodontiform fishes (Teleostei:  
513 Percomorphaceae). *Mol. Phylogenet. Evol.* 82, 131-145. (doi:10.1016/j.ympev.2014.10.011)
- 514           59. Gavryushkina A, Heath TA, Ksepka DT, Stadler T, Welch D, and Drummond AJ.  
515 2015. Bayesian total evidence dating reveals the recent crown radiation of penguins. *arXiv*  
516 preprint (<http://arxiv.org/pdf/1506.04797.pdf>)

	Total-evidence	Node-Dating (molecular and morphological data)	Node Dating (molecular only)
Afrotheria	106.3 (91.3, 123.9)	96.7 (78.6, 116.9)	92.9 (74.3, 114.5)
Paenungulata	99.3 (85.3, 115.4)	61.5 (55, 74.8)	61.8 (55, 76.2)
Afroinsectiphilia	NA	NA	90.2 (71.6, 110.7)
Proboscidea	29.5 (18.9, 41.1)	23.9 (14.6, 33.8)	24.5 (15.3, 34.5)
Sirenia	29.6 (17.6, 43.9)	26.9 (15.9, 39.7)	27.3 (15.5, 39.4)
Hyracoidea	21.9 (12.1, 33.3)	18.5 (8.4, 29.1)	18.7 (8.4, 28.8)
Afrosoricida	91.6 (77.1, 109.0)	89.5 (71.5, 109.1)	85.1 (67.3, 106.1)
Tenrecidae	77.5 (62.2, 92.2)	78.8 (62.0, 97.8)	76.7 (59.5, 96.3)
Chrysochloridae	34.3 (23.4, 46.7)	39.6 (27.6, 53.3)	40.4 (27.8, 56.0)
Macroscelidea	57.8 (45.0, 71.9)	75.2 (58.0, 95.7)	77.5 (58.6, 98.4)

517

518 **Table 1** Dates from the total-evidence analyses are older than the node-dating analysis but

519 the 95% posterior density shows overlap for crown Afrotheria.

Phylogeny	StableTraits	Brownian motion	Best-fitting model	ΔBPIC
Total Evidence	0.10 (0.02, 0.95)	1.45 (0.31, 6.82)	StableTraits	21.76725
Extant Only	0.13 (0.02, 12.48)	1.59 (0.28, 8.94)	StableTraits	53.5555
Node Dating (molecular only)	0.11 (0.02, 761.4)	0.77 (0.14-3.99)	StableTraits	57.42925
Node Dating (molecular and morphological data)	0.09 (0.02, 0.62)	0.53 (0.10, 2.75)	StableTraits	42.499

520

521 **Table 2.** Reconstruction of ancestral body size using StableTraits indicate the minimal

522 impact of fossil tips on root mass estimates.

523


524

**Figure 1.** The dated total-evidence phylogeny of the Afrotheria indicates a late Cretaceous origin for Afrotheria. Tubulidentata and Macroscelidea form successive outgroups to the Paenungulata (Sirenia, Proboscidea, Hyracoidea), and so the Afroinsectiphilia (Macroscelidea, Afrosoricida) is non-monophyletic. All major clades are highlighted: Proboscidea (purple), Sirenia (brown), Hyracoidea (navy), Tubulidentata (red), Macroscelidea (yellow), Chrysochloridae (blue), and Tenrecidae (green). Animal images public domain, except for the following from Wikipedia, and covered by Creative Commons licenses that are attributed to the following authors: Elephant (Ikiwaner), Hyrax (D. Gordon E. Robertson), Aardvark (Masur), Elephant shrew (Joey Makalintal), Golden mole (Hohum), and Tenrec (Wilfried Berns).


**Figure 2.** The effects of model selection are more evident than the inclusion of fossils. If fossils are included or excluded, there is a large increase in the morphological rate of evolution leading to the Paenungulata plus Tubulidentata (red branch) (a,b). The reconstructed body size is comparable between the total evidence and neontological studies that use the StableTraits models (c,d), and BM model (e,f).




(a) Total Evidence – stableTraits Rates




(b) Extant only – stableTraits Rates




(c) Total evidence ancestral states – stableTraits



(d) Total evidence ancestral states – bm



(e) Extant species ancestral states – stableTraits



(f) Extant species ancestral states – bm

